

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 8, 16, 17, 19 to 23, and 26 to 28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 16, and 26 to 28 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the pending claims were rejected under §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,681 (Emens) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,088 (Glance). As shown above, Applicant has amended the claims to define the invention with greater particularity. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 defines a computer-implemented method comprising obtaining a query for a database using one or more query generation rules, where the database comprises elements, each of which comprises fields. The elements comprise general information and the fields comprise specific information within the general information. The one or more query generation rules annotate the query with an element of the database and a field in the element. The method also includes generating a teaser that corresponds to the query, the teaser comprising a textual description that is based on at least one of the element and the field.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to annotating the query with an element of the database and a field in the element, where fields are part of elements and where elements comprise general information and fields comprise specific information within the general information.

As explained previously, the concept behind Emens is that queries are conceptually similar if they return similar results. Thus, Emens teaches that queries related to a given query

can be determined on the basis of overlap of returned search results. That is, if items returned on the basis of query A overlap with items returned on the basis of query B to a greater extent than results for any other query, then in this sense, query B is the most closely related query the system has seen to query A. Presenting query B to the user is a way to show the issuer of query A alternative ways to explore the information space that might be useful.

Emens, however, obtains its queries through searches of documents, not databases having elements and fields, and certainly not by annotating the query with the elements and fields in order to generate a teaser corresponding to the query.

Furthermore, as correctly noted on page 4 of the Office Action, Emens does not teach generating a teaser that corresponds to the query, where the teaser comprises a textual description. Glance was said to teach "generating a query database including all related queries information". Therefore, it was said that combining Glance and Emens would render claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In this regard, as understood by Applicant, Glance describes a system that is not altogether different from Emens in that the Glance system "captures the knowledge of other users who searched for similar information". (col. 4, lines 7 to 9). In particular, the Glance system maintains a database of queries and, when an input query is received by the system that matches a query from the database, the system presents the user with the query from the database (col. 5, lines 38 to 50). Figs. 4 and 5, and col. 6, line 46 to col. 7 line 22 were cited in the Office Action as evidence of generating a query database. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that this

portion of Glance describes generation of its "related queries" database. However, this generation has nothing whatsoever to do with the invention of claim 1.

More specifically, in claim 1, the query is annotated with an element of the database and a field within that element. Thereafter, a teaser is generated that is based on the element and the field. Applicant finds no disclosure, in Glance (or Emens) of annotating queries and generating teasers based on the annotation. Accordingly, even if Glance were combined with Emens in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the resulting hypothetical combination would still fail to disclose or suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art.

The remaining independent claims, namely claims 8, 16, and 26 to 28, each includes generating a query and a teaser in the manner of claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be patentable.

Dependent claim 4 specifies that the one or more query generation rules are domain specific, where the domain corresponds to a subject matter of the database. Dependent claim 5 specifies that the teaser is generated using one or more query matching rules, where the one or more query matching rules are domain specific, and where the domain corresponds to a subject matter of the database. The applied art does not show query generation rules or query matching rules that are domain specific, e.g., if the database concerns restaurants, the rules may be restaurant specific. The cited portion of Emens (page 5) of the Office Action merely describes generating queries based on prior search terms, and does not describe domain specificity.

Each of the remaining dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. The remaining dependent claims partake of the novelty of their corresponding independent claims and, as such, have not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.


Please apply any fees or credits due in this case, which are not already covered by check, to Deposit Account 06-105, referencing 10984-601001.

Applicant : Andrew R. Golding
Serial No. : 09/927,015
Filed : August 9, 2001
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-601001
Client Ref.: P-272

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2006



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21300930.doc